DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 211 005 HE 014 623

AUTHOR Slavin, Gerald M., Ed.; Colahan, Clark A., Ed.
TITLE [International Education Programs].
INSTITUTION New Mexico Univ., Albuquerque. Office of International Programs and Services.
PUB DATE May 81
NOTE 31p.
AVAILABLE FROM Office of International Programs and Services, 1717 Roma N.E., University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, NM 87131.
JOURNAL CIT Occasional Papers Series in International Education; v1 n1 May 1981

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS College Programs; *Cross Cultural Training; Foreign Nationals; *Foreign Students; Higher Education; *International Education; *Minicourses; Noncredit Courses; Program Administration; Program Development; School Business Relationship; *Study Abroad; *Undergraduate Study
IDENTIFIERS Overseas Campuses

ABSTRACT

Perspectives concerning the overall process of providing international education are considered in three articles. In "The Development of an International Commitment: A Case Study," Earl L. Backman describes the successful implementation of an international program at the University of North Carolina, Charlotte. The Program for International Studies, after five years of planning, was designed to develop an academic concentration for undergraduates, sponsor programs designed to heighten awareness on campus, and respond to the needs of the business community. Major developments, program funding, and strengths and weaknesses of the approach are considered. In "The Short Course for Overseas Participants: A Growing Educational Option," Judith A. Horowitz examines cross-cultural training programs, which offer foreign students and visitors to the United States intensive study for a shorter period than a traditional degree course. These short courses are conducted at a variety of U.S. locations, ranging from corporate headquarters to federal training centers, but especially at colleges and universities. The noncredit courses are designed to impart a particular skill or way of thinking or to expose the participants to a particular set of experiences or a new technology. Program administration is also addressed. In "Assessing the Contributions of Overseas Institutional American College Systems," Herbert Maza describes the role of semi-independent centers that offer studies abroad, and which allow colleges and universities to send students overseas for specialized studies, without the need to establish their own overseas program centers. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED211005

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

OCCASIONAL PAPERS SERIES IN INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION

May 1981

Volume 1, Number 1

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Office of Int'l Prog. & Services, Univ. of New Mexico
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CONTENTS

From the Editors.....2

The Development of an International Commitment: A Case Study
by Earl L. Backman.....3

The Short Course for Overseas Participants: A Growing Educational Option
by Judith A. Horowitz.....18

Assessing the Contributions of Overseas Institutional American College Systems
by Herbert Maza.....27

HE 014 623

From the Editors

With this first issue, we are pleased to be lauching the Occasional Papers Series in International Education. In recent years, it has been apparent to us that there is a growing need to establish more opportunities for communication among administrators working in offices responsible for international commitments at their universities. We found that many colleagues in the field shared our concern, and as a result we decided to take a modest step toward meeting this need by starting an Occasional Papers Series.

Our Editorial Board was then formed, consisting of ten distinguished educators from around the country. They are: Dr. Clark Coan, University of Kansas; Mrs. Phyllis Clark, University of California at San Diego; Dr. Robin B. Fuller, Vanderbilt University; Dr. Eugene R. Chamberlain, Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Dr. Dixon Johnson, Univeristy of Tennessee at Knoxville; Dr. Martin Limbird, Iowa State University; Dr. Dean C. Lomis, University of Delaware; Dr. Joe W. Neal, University of Texas at Austin; Dr. Ivan Putman, Jr., Empire State College; and Dr. R. Curtis Johnson, University of Colorado at Boulder.

We are convinced that in the 80's, it is essential for international educators to look at the profession in broad terms, examining their role within the overall mission of higher education. As you are aware, the international involvement, both academic and administrative, of U.S. colleges and universities developed primarily in the last 25 years, a period of rapid overall expansion. The current situation, in contrast, reflects the stringent financial limitations facing almost all educational institutions. Cutbacks, retrenchments, and reassessment of organizational priorities have been the inevitable result. The drastic reduction of an institution's international commitments is a real danger, and we all know of cases where this has already happened. For this reason, administrators of international educational programs have a particularly pressing need at this time to be in contact with each other, exploring strategies for convincing faculty and administration of the continuing need for maintaining an international component within the university's framework.

We urge our readers to give thought to sharing their individual experience at their schools. Innovative ways are already being implemented to improve programs and enhance prestige on U.S. campuses. Topics from the entire spectrum of international education will be welcomed, but preferably written from the perspective of offices with multiple responsibilities. Although articles may very well focus on an individual program, they should have broad implications for the whole process of internationalizing a college or university.

As the series begins, we are pleased to have three articles that address themselves to important issues of this kind.

Gerald M. Slavin Clark A. Colahan

Co-editors: Gerald M. Slavin and Clark A. Colahan
University of New Mexico

Editorial Board:

Dr. Eugene R. Chamberlain	Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Mrs. Phyllis Clark	University of California - San Diego
Dr. Clark Coan	University of Kansas
Dr. Robin B. Fuller	Vanderbilt University
Dr. Dixon C. Johnson	University of Tennessee - Knoxville
Dr. R. Curt Johnson	University of Colorado - Boulder
Dr. Martin Limbird	Iowa State University
Dr. Dean C. Lomis	University of Delaware
Dr. Joe W. Neal	University of Texas - Austin
Dr. Ivan Putnam	Empire State College - SUNY

Manuscript and subscription correspondence should be sent to the co-editors, Office of International Programs and Services, 1717 Roma N.E., University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, New Mexico, 87131. Issues appear twice a year in the spring and fall. Subscription rates are $8.00 per year, $4.00 for single copies.

Copyright © 1981, Earl L. Backman

THE DEVELOPMENT OF AN INTERNATIONAL COMMITMENT: A CASE STUDY

BY

EARL L. BACKMAN

The late twentieth-century world into which U.S. college and university students will graduate is becoming increasingly interdependent. During the past two decades the United States has experienced the evolution of world problems that have previously appeared to many Americans as inconsequential to our own growth and prosperity. Current issues such as trade relations, the allocation and conservation of resources, overpopulation, environmental quality, energy, poverty, lack of adequate communication, inflation, and the quest for peace all require international solutions. One response by the higher education community to understand the significance of these issues has been the development of campus-based international education programs. However, universities and colleges are finding that they need to explore ways of improving the international component of the curriculum, of enhancing student and faculty exchanges, of strengthening institutional commitments to international activities, and of developing more financial resources. In addition, many institutions lack a previous model for such programs and are faced by the question, "How do we get started?" The purpose of this article is to present one model -- a case study -- of the successful implementation of an international program. While it is located in a medium-sized, state-supported institution, many of its characteristics and activities are equally relevant to many types of universities and colleges. It serves as an example of what can be done with commitment, hard work, leadership, and a little bit of luck along the way.

Historical Development

In 1966, Dr. D. W. Colvard, the newly appointed chancellor of the University of North Carolina at Charlotte, indicated that one of the major objectives at UNCC would be the development of an institutional response to the challenges facing students, faculty, and indeed the community, which called for increased international awareness. He

---

Dr. Earl Backman is the director of the Center for International Studies, The University of North Carolina at Charlotte. This article is an excerpt from his forthcoming book entitled Approaches To International Education: Alternatives for Colleges and Universities, Backman, Earl L. (editor)

This book examines in detail eighteen different approaches to developing campus-based international programs. Examples are drawn from community colleges, private colleges and universities, and state supported institutions.

made it clear in his installation address that we, as Americans, have been negligent in facing up to the international facts of life. The rationale for this course of action was quite clear. The insularity of theprevious century is no longer, nor will it ever be again, a viable international posture for the United States. Our multinational corporations continue to stretch their strands of influence to the far corners of the globe; necessity forces our security system to function on a global stage; jets and communications satellites transport people and information to and from distant places as if they were adjacent; and key global issues defy resolution on a nation-by-nation basis. Chancellor Colvard asserted that an emerging institution, such as UNCC, had a major stake in providing students and the community with the international awareness to meet this challenge head on.

The institution decided, therefore, to build the necessary infrastructure required for the development of an international program, e.g., a faculty with the expertise and talent to focus the institution in the proper direction. From 1966 to 1972 faculty were hired particularly for an international focus, new courses added, and symposia sponsored, steps that when taken together provided the most rudimentry beginning of the structure.

In 1970, the vice-chancellor for academic affairs appointed an All-University International Studies Committee comprised of students, staff, and faculty from nine departments and charged it with the task of developing recommendations for an institutional international studies program. Specifically, the committee was to develop a program to meet the following objectives:

> to develop the international dimensions of general education in the University community; to better prepare students and pros- pective teachers for lives and careers in an increasingly inter- dependent world through acquisi- tion of knowledge and under- standing of the people with whom Americans share the planet earth; and to prepare future citizens and teachers to deal with cross- national problems by increasing their literacy in world affairs.

By 1972, the University of North Carolina at Charlotte had issued its first statement of institutional goals. Although the official committee was still engaged in deliberations, the institution went on record as committing itself "to contribute to the international understanding and intercultural sensitivity of students, faculty and administrators, and community leaders." Specifically, our objectives as an institution were stated as follows:

> 1. to develop student, teacher, and community exchange programs with specific universities and communities in foreign areas;
>
> 2. to provide for the communication of a variety of thought on all sides of international issues; and
>
> 3. to encourage travel, study, and internships in foreign areas.

Meanwhile, the committee charged with the making of specific recommendations which would operationalize the goal statement was continuing its efforts. Its philosophy began to take shape and soon reflected both an interdisciplinary and a comparative approach to international education. Campus-wide meetings were held, three outside consultants were invited to campus to pro-

vide valuable input into the process, subcommittees were established to study and make specific recommendations on differing program areas, and a final consolidated plan for the development of an International Studies Program emerged.

On March 1, 1973, the International Studies Committee submitted its "final report" to the vice-chancellor for academic affairs. In its formal recommendations the Committee made this statement:

> the Committee endorses the concept of a flexible, varied and evolving plan dedicated to the goal of promoting individual intellectual sensitivity to foreign and cross-national cultures and values. Our program should afford opportunities for the development of attitudes unencumbered by the limitations of our own social and cultural orientations. The objectives of such study should be a basic understanding of man, his human condition, his potential, his privilege and his obligation.

While the Committee report contained many recommendations, the most important called for the establishment of an international studies program, including an office and the appointment of a director; the development of a curriculum model which would allow students to obtain an interdisciplinary concentration in international studies in addition to meeting existing departmental requirements for the baccalaureate degree; the expansion of overseas opportunities for faculty and students; and increasing the international activities for the entire University and Charlotte community.

On February 1, 1974, this program was approved by the University Intercollege Academic Policy and Curriculum Committee with slight modifications. The university senate endorsed the program on March 29, 1974; and after further review by the UNCC administration, it was sent to the general administration of the University of North Carolina on May 9, 1974. On October 3, 1974, the vice-chancellor for academic affairs received notification from the general administration that the International Studies Program proposal with a concentration in international studies had been approved, but no money was being appropriated.

On August 25, 1975, Chancellor Colvard, in a memorandum to the University community stated "this proposal has been meticulously studied and thoroughly reviewed on campus. In fulfilling this long-term commitment, I am now announcing the establishment of the 'Program for International Studies' at UNCC. This programm will be staffed initially by a part-time director and a secretary."

Furthermore, he added,

> success in acheiving the objectives of this program, as stated in the "1973 Report by the International Studies Committee," will depend in large part upon the cooperation between the Director of the Program for International Studies and the deans, department chairmen, and faculty. While the Director will coordinate various International Studies activities on and off campus, the successful implementation of programs will require co-operative, joint efforts by all interested parties. It is expected that the Director will work within the existing structure of the University by coordinating activities through the various colleges, departments, the Dean of Students Office, and

the Institute for Urban Studies and Community Service. In implementing the Program for International Studies, I am requesting that Dr. Earl Backman assume the directorship. He will serve in this capacity for the academic year 1975-1976 on a part-time basis, while remaining in his current position. He will report to the provost on all matters relating to International Studies. A separate office has been established tentatively in the Reese Administration Building. Following termination of Dr. Backman's position as Assistant to the Chancellor, he will continue to direct the Program for International Studies from an appropriate location.

After more than five years of planning, review, and discussion, the Program for International Studies became a reality. With the strong endorsement from faculty and top administrative leadership, particularly the chancellor, a course was set to expand the international dimension on the campus. During the first year the program established three major thrusts designed to involve the university and the community in the development of an increased international awareness. The three thrusts, which responded both to the 1972 Goal Statement and to the original committee report, were as follows: (1) to develop an academic concentration for undergraduates; (2) to sponsor programs designed to heighten awareness on campus; and (3) to respond to the needs of the business community.

Prior to an examination of UNCC's international effort, successes and future trends, a brief highlighting of major developments during the first five years will assist in understanding the nature of institutional involvement in international education.

Program Highlights

1975-76:

1. Seven campus events sponsored
2. First overseas summer study-travel trip
3. Began publishing International Studies Bulletin
4. Raised $8,200 in contributions from the business community for faculty and program development
5. Total operating budget (including personnel) was $22,500

1976-77:

1. Full-time director and secretary
2. Half-time position for foreign student advisor
3. First grants received -- four for $90,000
4. Eleven campus and community events sponsored
5. Two overseas summer study-travel trips
6. 35 students concentrating in International Studies
7. Move out of administration building to main academic complex
8. Supported 24 faculty in professional development program
9. Raised $8,200 from local businesses
10. Total operating budget (including personnel) was $126,000

1977-78:

1. New Mission and Goals Statement reaffirms commitment to international studies
2. Established first Semester Abroad Program
3. Received five grants totaling $122,000

4. Sponsored 16 campus and community events
5. Five overseas summer study programs
6. Advising 116 foreign students and 60 students concentrating in International Studies
7. Developed five new interdisciplinary courses
8. Sponsored 17 lecturers and visiting speakers
9. Assisted 22 faculty under Faculty Development Program
10. Received over $10,000 from local businesses
11. Total operating budget (including personnel) was $166,000

1978-79:

1. Program for International Studies becomes Center for International Studies
2. Three additional professional staff and two support staff hired
3. English Language Training Institute developed
4. Received 3 grants totaling $89,000
5. Advising 200 international students and 80 students concentrating in International Studies
6. Sponsored 16 campus and community events
7. Sponsored 13 lecturers and visiting speakers
8. Assisted 20 faculty under Faculty Development Program
9. Initiated first Faculty Exchange Program
10. Initiated first Student Exchange Program
11. Seven summer Travel/Study Programs
12. Total operating budget (including personnel) was $215,000

1979-80:

1. Additional space allocated, doubling previous amount
2. Total staff size reaches seven professional and six support on a full-time basis and four part-time support staff
3. Sponsored 19 activities on and off campus
4. Supported professional activities of 34 faculty members
5. Sponsored lectures by 14 off-campus speakers
6. Sponsored eight summer programs overseas and two semester programs (India and Denmark)
7. Coordinated two faculty exchanges and four student exchange programs
8. Business contributions reach $13,000
9. Received three grants
10. Initiated faculty colloquia series
11. Total operating budget for year exceed $400,000 (funds from state, contributions, grants, contracts, participant fees)

Significant Factors Effecting Program Development

The Center for International Studies has taken ten years to reach maturity -- five years to come into existence and the second five years to develop to its present state. During this time frame several elements have been significant factors in the Center's success. Whereas it is not possible to prioritize these factors, as their importance has varied with the stage of development, it is, however, possible to enumerate them Important to note is the fact that these most significant elements of success have in turn become the Center's strengths. The following are listed as most important in our development:

1. Major institutional commitment to international education by institution's highest administrative officers (Indicated by resource allocation, Mission and Goals statements, program encouragment.

2. Strong support and endorsement by key segments of the UNCC faculty.

3. Appointment of full-time director, with mandate to develop international program with little administrative interference (freedom to take risks).

4. Development of dedicated and talented professional and support staff with the Center.

5. Opportunity to develop community programs, which in turn provide an additional resource base for the Center.

6. Centralized approach and administration of all aspects of international education programs at UNCC, combined with a desire and commitment not only to service international needs of institutional units, but also to increase the number of faculty and students involved in international programs.

7. Outside funding from grants, contributions, revenue generating activities, and contracts.

Center for International Studies
Funding

It is perhaps trite to state "As the funding goes, so goes the programming." But in the Center's situation it is an accurate reflection of reality. To understand how International Studies accomplishes its objectives, stimulates international awareness, and increases the international dimension on campus and in the community, an analysis of funding patterns is a prerequisite. While there is some change from year to year in both available resources and patterns of expenditures, there are not usually significant variations.

As a method of gaining perspective on the Center's funding patterns, revenue distributions for two different academic years are presented. The two years chosen were 1976-77 (the first year with a full-time director) and 1980-81 (the most recent year for which data are available).

The budget comparison between 1976-77 and 1980-81 serves two useful puposes. First, it dramatically illustrates the tremendous growth in program potential as a result of increased revenues. Secondly, it is apparent at a quick glance that while revenue from all sources is up for the period, the major increase is found in participant fees. Furthermore, if we examine somewhat more closely the 1980-81 budget a clearer understanding develops. State appropriated funds (including $56,000 in salaries and $8,000 in operating expenses) is the most constant source of income and less subject to change. It is, however, only 15% of the total budget for the Center. Grants, both from the federal government and private foundations, while making a greater contribution to the total budget, are far less secure and very likely to vary considerably from year to year. It is important to develop a funding strategy

1976-77 BUDGET

	Revenue Sources	Amount
1.	State (includes two positions)	$31,800.00
2.	Grants	$38,049.50
3.	Business Contributions	$ 8,375.00
4.	Participant Fees (Travel abroad, Business Seminars)	$ 2,400.00
	Total	$80,524.50

1980-81 BUDGET

	Revenue Sources	Amount
1.	State (includes three postions)	$64,320.00
2.	Grants	$99,167.00
3.	Contracts	$44,900.00
4.	Contributions	$12,480.00
5.	Participant Fees (Travel Abroad, Business Seminars. Great Decisions, ETLI)	$207,870.00
	Total	$428,737.00

that reduces dependence on this source for operating expenses. Steps to take in this direction include obtaining increased state appropriations and negotiating long-term contracts with organizations and institutions that are deemed beneficial to both parties involved.

While still the smallest percentage of the total budget, the contributions from business firms are highly important to the Center's operation. As one might expect, the primary reason for this is due to the flexibility of the funding. For instance, because it is not designated or required to cover expenses of the program from which it was generated, these funds can be allocated at the discretion of the Center's director.
Faculty development projects remain the major source of expenditures for these dollars.

Participant fees remain the single greatest source of funding for the Center. This is somewhat deceptive at first, because this revenue is used largely to cover the expenditures of the programs which generated the revenue. This is particularly true with respect to the English Language Training Institute, Travel Abroad Programs, and the Great Decisions Program. Business seminars, the other large source of participant revenue, generate funds that can be allocated to cover expenses of other programs.

Revenue is only one side of the budget coin; expenditures complete the other. If we take the 1980-81 academic year and examine the distribution of expenditures, a more complete picture is obtained.

As might be expected, personnel salaries and fringe benefits consume the largest share of the budget. This line includes three state funded positions--director, coordinator, and a secretary--and two coordinators, three instructors, five secretaries and seven students working part-time that are funded out of program revenue. Program expenses account for the second largest portion of expenditures, the majority being expended for tuition repayments to the university and travel expenses for participants on travel abroad programs. Faculty development accounts for $32,500, most of which is paid out in the form of honoraria, released time reimbursement and travel. The remaining expenditures are distributed between staff travel and basic office expenses. Of these expenses, excluding travel, duplication and telephone are the most costly.

A final note on the budget is most appropriate at this point. Equal in impor- tance to budget size, or nearly so, is the degree of control over expenditures and the budgeting process. As is often the case at state institutions there is a great variation in budgeting flexibility depending on the source of the revenue. For instance, state appropriated funds, grant monies, and resources from contracts are tightly audited to guarantee that expenditures are for those items in which funds have been appropriated. Revenue coming in to the Center in one of these three categories is spent with the approval of and authorization by the director. A member of the support staff has the critical job of checking each expenditure to insure the necessary funds are present and of depositing income into the appropriate accounts. The Center has approximately twenty major accounts, each with six to twenty-five different line items. Each line item in the account must have a corresponding budgeted amount of money. In state accounts, grants, and contracts, expenditures for a line item cannot exceed the amount budgeted. For instance, if $2000 is budgeted for travel in the state appropriated account, that is the maximum amount that can be expended for travel from the account. In addition to the checking of expendi-

1980-81

BUDGET

Items	Expenditures
1. Personnel Salaries	$187,320.00
2. Fringe Benefits	$ 19,397.00
3. Travel (staff)	$ 12,000.00
4. Duplicating, supplies, telephone, postage, equipment, etc.	$ 13,470.00
5. Faculty Development	$ 32,500.00
6. Programs (honoraria, travel, participant travel costs, tuition, etc.)	$164,050.00
	$428,737.00

tures by Center staff, the business office also monitors these accounts.

The vast majority of accounts are program accounts, set up to handle receipts and expenditures from specific programs, e.g., the English Language Training Institute. These funds too are treated as University money, but there is greater flexibility than in those previously mentioned. Each July the director sets up a budget for each program account, estimating revenue, and distributing the budget over all line items. This however, can at best be only an estimate. During the academic year expenditures can exceed that amount budgeted for a specific line item. However, total receipts in the account must always be equal to or greater than expenditures for all line items combined. If the account goes into the "red" during a specific month, the business office will notify the director and request a transfer of funds to balance out the account. As was noted previously, the Center director approves and authorizes all expenditures out of these program accounts, but it is the individual within the Center charged with the handling of accounts who carefully examines all program accounts monthly to insure sufficient receipts are available to cover outstanding expenditures.

The third category of revenue, financial contributions, is the most flexible and governed less tightly by state restrictions. These monies are deposited into the UNCC Foundation and available for use by the director. However, while flexibility exists in how these funds are spent, all expenditures must be fully documented, with receipts, at the time a request to expend is made. Again, only the Center director is authorized to expend these amounts.

In summary, the following are key aspects of the Center's budget:

1. Revenue is generated from a variety of sources;
2. "Soft money" characterizes most of the budget;
3. Personnel and programs represent the two largest categories of expenditures;
4. The Center director approves and authorizes expenditures from all budgets (although approval to travel, purchase major equipment , for major office renovation, and to purchase items off state contract must be approved by the vice-chancellor for research and public service and/or the vice-chancellor for business affairs).

Strengths and Weaknesses of Approach

The institutional model that has been developed at UNCC represents only one of many methods by which to strengthen the international dimension of a campus. It has been proved to have strengths that warrant its implementation at other institutions of higher education. Assessing its utilization as a model for other universities and colleges necessitates examining not only these program strengths, but also the weaknesses. Therefore, the purpose of this section is to highlight briefly both the positive and attractive virtues of UNCC's approach, as well as those factors viewed to be the major weaknesses and potentional dangers of a strategy of this nature.

Strengths

1. Major institutional commitment to international education by the institution's highest administrative officers and specific mention in mission statement.

2. State funded office with a full-time director authorized to develop institutional programs strengthening the international dimension on campus.

3. Highly centralized approach and administration of international education programs, combined with a desire and commitment to service not only international needs of institutional units, but also to increase the number of faculty and students involved in international activities.

4. A staff with the skills and abilities to exercise professional leadership in the community, state, region and nation.

5. Professional and support staff with requisite complimentary skills and abilities.
   Specifically,
   a. Professional staff dedicated to carrying out goals of Center and extreme willingness to work well together.
   b. Support staff that has the same dedication to Center's orientation as professional staff, and the necessary skills and commitment to support a large programming base.

6. Strong commitment to international programming in the community. This reduces both the psychological and physical barrier separating UNCC from the Charlotte residents.

7. Budget derived from diversified sources, lessening impact should one source fail to produce anticipated revenue.

8. Diversified consitutency, increasing the base of support for sponsored activities.

9. Strong faculty development program; this leads to strong support by faculty in many academic departments.

10. Center not placed in an academic college; it is easier to draw upon academic resources from all colleges and not subject the Center to the constraints of a single college dean.

11. Director reports to a top university administrative official. This strengthens access to key decision makers.

12. Development of community programs that impact on all regions of North Carolina.
    Specifically,
    a. Great Decisions
    b. Public Forums
    c. Travel Programs
    d. Workshops and seminars for groups such as school teachers and representatives of international business.

13. Necessary skills and ability to address issues relative to the UNCC Mission and Goals Statement--addressing issues in a rapidly changing technological society in which persons are in ever closer contact with one another.

14. Major commitment to facilitating and supporting matriculation of international students.

15. Utilization of business community for both resources and programming.

16. Utilization of faculty resources in all phases of programming.

17. Strong commitment on the part of the Center and departments to develop institutional exchanges.

18. Strong beginning at providing UNCC students with an overseas experience.

Weaknesses of and Threats to the Center for International Studies

In order to maximize the accomplishments of the Center's goals and objectives, there is a need to strive toward reducing weaknesses and threats that undermine strengths. Some of these are internal, while others are external and beyond the capabilites of the institution. They are as follows:

1. Lack of visibility to all sectors of the campus with regard to the services and programs available.

2. Too heavy a reliance on funds that are not state appropriated; this means that new dollars must be constantly obtained to maintain programs.

3. Lack of a state allocated position to perform necessary functions related to international student services.

4. Lack of clearly stated support for an increase in the funding for international education by the general administration of the University of North Carolina.

5. Majority of students, and to a lesser extent the faculty, that fail to see the need for an increased international awareness that is reflected in the curriculum, in the allocation of resources, and in campus programming.

6. Faculty reward system that fails to recognize adequately the advantages and usefulness of faculty overseas experience.

7. Need for revising overseas travel regulations in order that they reflect properly the necessity of selective participation in the international scholarly community.

8. Too few courses in the curriculum with an international dimension.

9. Insufficient funding to respond adequately to faculty development needs.

10. Location of the Center outside college structure; this means there is no natural base of strength from any one college (particularly at budget allocation time) and a tendency for animosities to develop if Center resources appear (to an outsider) as too large.

The Center for International Studies at the University of North Carolina at Charolotte has evolved over time to respond to the international needs of the campus and community. Its strengths have enabled the Center to make a major contribution to the process of internationalization. Much remains to be done during the decade of the 1980's -- success will depend on contin-

uing to counter the above mentioned weaknesses and threats to the model that has developed.

Strategy for the 1980's

A description of current programming priorities is a rather easily accomplished task, and the presentation of the Center's historical evolution only slightly more difficult. But an accurate prognostication of the future during the next decade requires far more than a crystal ball or a ouija board; it takes the "wisdom of Solomon". While not claiming to possess such wisdom, still we must reexamine constantly what has been accomplished, evaluate current strategies, and perhaps most importantly, look several years ahead and think about new directions, funding requirements and sources, and how best to combat the threats that were mentioned above.

It is obvious to most observers that the need for an internationally aware citizenry will only grow during the 1980's. Today's students -- tomorrow's decision makers -- must be "tuned in" to such much used terms as "global problems," "interdependence," "resource distribution," "north-south", and the list could go on. Students and communities must be presented with programs, activities, courses, workshops, institutes, and lectures that can increase the level of international awareness to a much higher degree than is currently present. International programs, if they are to be viable in the late 1980's, must respond to this need.

Staff at the Center for International Studies have addressed this issue. In addition to striving to meet the goals and objectives of the Center (as outlined earlier), issues to which major attention will be given during the 1980's are as follows:

1. Careful and selective recruitment of high quality international students, particularly from parts of the world not well represented at UNCC (eg. Latin America, East Asia, and Southeast Asia). Such recruitment will include a more balanced foreign student population between graduate and undergraduate students. Faculty travel, research, and teaching in these areas will be the primary technique for increasing the number and quality of international students.

2. Continued development and refinement of the English Language Training Institute. It is the desire of the staff that the ELTI serve as a major vehicle for orienting international students to American culture and the university, while at the same time serving to screen students not prepared to handle a university academic program.

3. Expanding, enhancing, and improving overseas opportunities and experiences for UNCC undergraduate students. This means taking full advantage of the International Student Exchange Program, as well as directly confronting the single largest obstacle, finances. Creation of internships, developing scholarships, and utilizing financial aid to its limits are all techniques to be fully explored.

4. Increasing considerably the number of courses taught at UNCC that contain an inter-

national dimension. To accomplish this task, the faculty at UNCC must be further internationalized by participating in overseas research and teaching. Funds must be obtained to provide faculty with this experience if the curriculum is to be altered substantially. Our goal is to make it impossible for a student in the 1980's to obtain an undergraduate degree from UNCC, after four years of study, wihout having had an international experience -- courses, activities, or overseas study/travel.

5. Develop far more extensive faculty exchange opportunities over the next few years. Such exchanges will bring foreign scholars to UNCC, provide opportunities for UNCC faculty to gain an international experience, and lead to collaborative research.

6. Establish an entrance requirement of two years' study of one foreign language in middle or high school. Students entering without fulfilling such a requirement should be granted provisional status until they complete second-year college level proficiency in one foreign language. The world of the 1980's demands citizens to have an enhanced international understanding and ability to communicate. To accomplish this, students engaged in language training must also be provided with a sense of the history and culture of the people whose language they are studying.

7. Provide more support for international faculty development. Additional funding will be sought from the local business community.

8. Assist in the development of a faculty reward system that does not penalize a faculty member for undertaking an overseas assignment. Methods need to be devised to qualitatively evaluate such experiences, as is done for on-campus work. In fact, recognition and rewards for international activities should be provided.

9. Seek more diversified sources of funding for the international office. Continued programming in the 1980's will depend on successful funding patterns. More assistance from the state budget is a major objective.

10. Urban universities, such as UNCC, in the 1980's must be more attuned than ever before to trends in higher education. Concepts like "life long learning," "continuing education," or "community based programming" will be increasingly important as the community requires university outreach. The Center for International Studies will continue to place a high priority on public programming by providing high quality events that serve to increase international awareness and involvement.

As the University attempts to move in directions outlined above, responding to new pressures, recent trends, and

institutional parochialism, additional funding for international activities will be necessary. Federal and private grants will continue to be important by providing seed money, initiating new projects, and for certain specific research projects. However, it is not anticipated that money from these sources will increase above the 1980-81 level. Therefore, it is not possible to plan on grant funds or the federal government being the solution for funding problems.

North Carolina can, and should, do more by way of support for university efforts in international education. Certainly the Center will push for and plan to receive, additional state funded positions, especially in the foreign student services office. As the institution grows, revenue will increase and the state operating budget will slowly be enlarged. However, budget allocations are not likely to increase at the same pace as inflation. So while it is likely that UNCC will commit more state funds to support international activities in the 1980's, growth will not match requirements, necessitating the Center to look elsewhere.

In order that the Center address the challenges listed above, additional funding must come from the two remaining sources, contributions from the business community and participant fees. Marketing the resouces of the univesity in the international field and adequately describing the international institutional needs are the building blocks for a major corporate sponsors program. The program's aim would be to obtain, from the local business community, $50,000 to $100,000 per year for support of faculty development, curriculum development, and faculty exchanges. Given the international focus found in the Charlotte business community, this is a realistic goal.

Participant fees represent the other major souce of new funding for meeting program goals. Summer institutes to train teachers of English as a second language, business seminars, and overseas contracts for the training of trainers (e.g., teachers or engineers or computer programmers) are just some of the programs that will be explored during the 1980's. Revenue generated will be used to strengthen the international dimension on and off campus, and to provide additional opportunities for both faculty and student exchange.

It is anticipated that the decade of the 1980's will bring a continued commitment on the part of the UNCC administration to international activities. Creativity, innovation, and risk-taking will be rewarded, as the payoff will be a strong international dimension and the requisite funds to sustain the momentum. Institutional weaknesses and threats (as listed above) do exist, but there is an optimistic view that they can be overcome.

Summary

A world that has changed radically over the last quarter century leaves us with no viable alternative but to develop and maintain a first-class apparatus enabling Americans to cope with the changing environment. The higher education community should, and must, take the lead. This article illustrates how UNCC's response to this challenge has been the creation and development of the Center for International Studies. Students, faculty, and staff, as well as the surrounding community, need the opportunity to learn, understand, and experience the impact of this dynamic world. The approach described above offers but one way of achieving this goal. While it is applicable to many institutions of higher education, there certainly exist many alternative methods for successfully developing an international commitment. Regardless of the approach we must, at a minimum, increase our competence to understand and deal successfully with other peoples in a changing world.

Copyright © 1981, Judith A Horowitz

THE SHORT COURSE FOR OVERSEAS PARTICIPANTS: A GROWING EDUCATIONAL OPTION[1]

BY

JUDITH A. HOROWITZ

Cross-cultural training programs are on the increase. These are programs that bring foreign students and visitors to the United States for an intensive period of study that is far shorter and more sharply focused than a traditional degree course. These short courses are conducted throughout the United States at a variety of institutions, ranging from corporate headquarters to federal training centers, but especially at colleges and universities. As these programs become more popular, they present challenging tasks for administrators.

Program Attributes

Cross-cultural programs take a variety of forms, from the brief study tour to the highly specialized training course to the more lengthy and academic program of study in an applied field. They are non-degree courses, which are typically designed to impart a particular skill or way of thinking or to expose the participants to a particular set of experiences or a new technology. The duration ofsuch courses is anywhere from a few weeks to a few months, though some last longer. Some programs are ad hoc and are conducted only once, but most programs are offered on a regular, ongoing basis.

The objectives of the specialized short course are quite specific. Each program is tailor-made to meet the needs of a small group of people. The participants are not expected to fit into the established routines of the host institution. Rather, the program is "created" by the university for a targeted group of students. Participants in a program may all come from the same country or from many different countries, but upon arrival in the United States and for the duration of the program, they are treated as a group. Members of the group are expected to follow the same schedule of activities, except for individually arranged internships or special study tours. The fact that the program soon embraces a tightly bonded group, whose members interact intensively and somewhat exclusively with one another, makes the short course fundamentally different from a degree program in which each student interacts on his own with the whole university.

Contrary to the typical practice in degree programs, the process of selecting students does not usually involve their individual application, followed by the decision of the university admissions office. Selection of participants for a specialized course is most often left to the sending country or to whoever sponsors the participant. While there is an application process for acceptance for a program, acceptance is

---

The author, Judith A. Horowitz is Professorial Lecturer and Director of Teacher Education at American University. She has also served as Co-Director of a cross-cultural training program, the African Educators Program.

not the result of an admisssions screening process that takes into account grades, test scores, recommendations, and English facility. The decisive voice about who will attend rests with the sending country or sponsor, with the host institution sometimes exercising veto power.

In age and career experience, the composition of the participants in such a program is different from that of students in the usual degree program. The participants are frequently selected to attend a program because of outstanding career performance or potential. This means that they tend to be older, more set in their ways, and more conscious of their status. They are not necessarily readily adaptable to a stay in a foreign country, receptive to new information, or to their reduced status as "students". At the same time, their expectations for the course are usually quite definite. Some participants may find the program too difficult or too concentrated in one area or off the mark for them. A few may be distracted and anxious about responsibilities and families left at home. On occasion, a participant will have insufficient motivation, because, since the program is not a degree program, the criteria of success are quite different. A certificate of completion is typically awarded at the end of short courses, not withstanding low levels of performance. Most of the time, however, participants arrive at a university feeling privileged to have been sent for a course and hopeful that it will have a direct payoff in the acquisition of a specialized body of knowledge or technical training.

Sponsorship of the specialized short course is not straightforward and clear. Generally, there is at least a sending governemnt and a host institution, where the course is conducted. Funding for the entire pro- gram may come from the sending country. Often, the university acts as a subcontractor for a program that is funded by a third party, frequently a United States government agency like the Agency for International Development (AID) or the International Communication Agency (ICA). AID, for example, sponsors a course at Georgia Institute of Technology for Philippino officials interested in alternative energy sources; programs at Syracuse, Connecticut, and Pittsburgh are designed to help public-sector officials improve their management skills. Other programs are sponsored by organizations like the American Association of University Women, the World Bank, and the United Nations. Sometimes, individual participants receive funding to attend a particular course from AID or ICA or from a variety of international organizations. Sponsorship can denote only financial responsibility for a program that is actually administered by another institution, but it can also mean full responsibility for the program.

There is an increasing number of short courses, jointly sponsored by the government of sending countries and American universities, to provide specialized training on a contractural basis. The Malaysian Institute for Public Administration, for instance, recently arranged with American University in Washington, D.C., for twenty-four government officials to attend a three-month training program. Malaysia also has contracts for short courses at Purdue University, the University of Texas at Austin, and the Educational Testing Service in Princeton. The Institute of Training and Organizational Development at the University of Pittsburgh has contracts with several countries, including Egypt, Brazil, Kenya, and Nigeria. The Nigerian government has been particularly active in approaching American univer- sities for special kinds of programs.

The Growth of Specialized International Programs

Unfortunately, there are no complete statistics on the numbers of participants in such programs, but there are some suggestive figures. The Immigration and Naturalization Service reports that the number of "exchange visitors" -- a category that includes students, scholars, trainees, leaders, and others who come to the United States for special programs lasting less than one year -- increased from 46,000 in 1975 to 53,319 by 1978. This category includes about 600 Fulbright scholars and some others who are not attending courses.[2] Still, the remaining numbers are impressive, and so is the rate of growth: 16 percent in a three-year period. ICA reports a comparable 20 percent increase in the number of short-term visitors under the Educational and Cultural Exchange Program for FY 1974 to FY 1979, a considerable increase over the preceding five year period. Estimates are that as many as 1,300 specialized, short, non-degree programs for foreign participants now take place annually in the United States.[3]

There are several reasons to expect a considerable increase in the number of short-term programs in the years ahead. These reasons derive from existing trends in foreign student enrollment, opportunities for new categories of overseas visitors to come to the United States, the economic advantages inherent in short specialized programs, the skilled manpower needs of newly wealthy developing countries, and a new burst of interest on the American side in cross-cultural exchange.

The number of foreign students enrolled in degree courses at American universities is growing rapidly, by 12 to 16 percent per year.[4] The spinoff effect of this record enrollment is bound to help produce more short courses as well. The pool of foreign alumni of American universities is expanding, and many of those alumni, who have spent years in the United States, would like to return. A brief period of technical training is the sort of opportunity they welcome.

To this pool of participants must be added several categories of participants who formerly would have stayed home. Since foreign currencies now buy more in the United States, it has become feasible to send abroad groups, such as Japanese school teachers or Saudi Arabian traffic policemen, who have traditionally received their training entirely at home. Many more programs are available exclusively for women, many of whom would have had little opportunity for overseas study just a few years ago. A number of developing countries have greatly expanded their systems of higher education. From a handful of universities a few years ago, Nigeria is moving toward a university in each of its nineteen states, with an enormously increased output of graduates. Malaysia has quadrupled the number of its universities in the last decade, and increased the number of students some sixfold. With the expansion of university education in many developing countries, the number of candidates eligible for short courses abroad also expands.

Even with the decline of the dollar relative to other currencies and increased buying power, some foreign countries that have traditionally sent students for degree programs in the United States have begun to doubt the need to spend thousands of dollars in tuition fees. Government officials sometimes wonder whether a lengthy degree course is worth the investment and whether the same objectives could not be achieved through the mechanism of a shorter, more sharply-focused, and far less costly, specialized program. They are becoming increasingly aware of the advantages of short courses in which students can acquire new skills and some

degree of sophistication quickly for a more modest investment of time and money than is possible in a typical degree course.

Other countries are increasingly utilizing both degree courses and short courses. OPEC countries are sending increasing numbers of students to the United States for enrollment in degree programs.[5] The same countries are also signing bilateral agreements with American universities that can provide them with training courses designed to meet their rapidly increasing manpower needs. Resource-rich countries, with per capita incomes too high to qualify for AID assistance or with the desire for programs that AID or other sponsors might not choose to fund, have the means to afford their own programs.

There are also non-expense-related benefits for the sending country in utilizing specialized short programs. The sending country can not only send more students; it can also hlep decide who will go. People whose poitions or whose families cannot be left for long periods of time can be induced to attend short programs. The lengthy and at times risky university admissions process, which frequently scatters students across the United States at institutions of varying quality, can be avoided. When it initiates the request for a special course, the sending country can also play a significant role in determining what will be studied, as well as who can best profit from the instruction. Contractual arrangements can specify course content with greater particularity than degree requirements permit. The substantive part of the program can emphasize practical matters relevent to the concerns of the sending country.

The control factor makes it especially easy to see why there has recently been growth in the number of short programs that were actually initiated and sponsored by sending country governments. Because the participants are abroad for only a few months and usually function as a group, often even for social purposes, countries fearing the effects of extensive exposure to Western culture may find the very structured nature of the specialized program preferable as well. Likewise, countries nervous about large numbers of students who fail to return home at the end of long stays in North America can be assured that the participants in the specialized program will return.

Given these advantages, it is easy to see why specialized programs are increasingly attractive for sending countries and participants alike. They are also advantageous to American institutions. In an era of financial stringency in higher education, short programs at universities can take up a bit of the slack. Training programs can be conducted by faculty with diminished student enrollments in their courses. And finally, as the recent President's Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies demonstrates, in what might be called the post-Vietnam and post-Iran period, there is a strong current of opinion that advocates an urgent effort to learn more about other cultures and social systems, particularly through cross-cultural exchange.[6]

Problems of Program Management

All of the problems of putting together any kind of program are compounded manifold by the international character of the programs we are discussing. The frequent difficulty of telephone and mail communications in the developing world, the imperfect understanding that North American institutions usually have of developing countries, and the equally imperfect understanding sending countries may have of the American educational system -- all of these can generate a considerable number of mistaken assumptions and un-

gratified expectations.

If the short, concentrated, specialized course is to succeed, everything must happen according to a well planned schedule. With a limited time and a small group of participants, the effect of errors in program administration can be much greater than it otherwise might be. Moreover, the very nature of the program means its success is dependent on personnel, many of whom must be assembled on an ad hoc basis and who therefore may not be fully committed to or understanding of the goals of the program. Consequently, there is a great deal of room for problems to develop in the day-to-day operation of the program, and there is limited time for treating them.

The period necessary to prepare for a program is frequently longer than the course itself. If it is to run smoothly, all the parts must be synchronized well in advance of the participants' arrival. One of the main obstacles to program planning, however, is that the program is almost always planned for a group about whom the administrators know very little. Even a program that is being repeated and ran well last year may turn out to be wrong for this year's participants.

Program administrators must often, therefore, plan in the dark. They must prepare for an especially demanding group of students, whose full range of problems often remains obscured until their arrival in the United States. Administrators must commit themselves to a program design that is largely unalterable once the participants do arrive and reveal their various expectations and interests.

The schedule of activities is almost always full. A sensibly designed program will set aside time for recreation, cultural orientation, and the solution of individual problems as they arise. To balance the academic work of the course with these other concerns means the participants' days are frequently overscheduled. And so, by trying to anticipate everybody's needs, administrators sometimes serve nobody's. Many participants have never before traveled outside their own country, have never been on an airplane, and are not prepared for the pace of American life. Yet, some administrators allow them no time to recover from jet lag, initial culture shock, and the very idea that a nine o'clock session actually starts at nine. The administrator who tries to compensate for the shortness of the program and its inflexibility by overscheduling is in trouble from the start. So is the administrator who does not, at the beginning of the program, take into account what "being on time" means to different people, particularly in making commitments for a large group of people.

Once a program has begun, it is difficult for the staff to modify the plans. Most directors would like to cater to the professional, intellectual, and personal differences among the participants. However, adding to the already full schedule is unwise for the reasons just mentioned. Besides, meeting the needs of one set of participants necessitates the possibility of offending participants whose preferences or needs cannot be met. Budget constraints also make it difficult to alter the program. Extra programming means expanding the budget. Even reducing the schedule of activities can cause trouble. It risks disappointing participants who had counted on a particular activity. Furthermore, since group tickets for concerts and plays and commitments to program instructors and home hospitality hosts are made weeks and even months before the program starts, cancellation of activities may result in forfeiture of tickets, salary, and good will. The burden of program planning is all the greater because of the difficulty of program modification once the program has begun.

The hiring of personnel for specialized programs is still another problem. Some programs, such as those which are conducted at the Institute of Training at the University of Pittsburgh, have a cadre of year-round staff to administer their short courses. Even these programs, however, operate with the help of adjunct personnel, and most others rely heavily on such personnel. Selecting them is not easy. The academic demands of the program oblige the director to choose instructors with expertise in a particular area or field of study. The instructor with appropriate credentials does not necessarily have much knowledge about developing countries or the best ways to teach students from them. University faculty, used to perhaps one or two unobtrusive foreign students in a class, often have trouble shifting gears for a whole group of students in a specialized course. Participants sometimes find the instructors too vague or theoretical for their practical concerns. Sometimes the instructors are considered too junior or too condescending. Often the teaching strategies employed and the manner of addressing the group seems strange or inappropriate. During one session on school counseling, a professor laced his discussion with American ethnic jokes. The participants did not understand his humor, but they felt certain it was in poor taste. As a result, they undervalued much of the substance of the session, which was intended to lay some of the foundation for later parts of the course.

Private consultants are often employed as lecturers or seminar leaders in specialized programs because they have had overseas employment, especially in development projects. The kind of practical advice they can give is useful for participants searching for ways to transfer what they are learning to their particular experiences. Problems arise when consultants have ideological axes to grind or business interests to pursue. One young woman speaking to a group of Asians had a pet notion that the United States government was trying to sell "aid packages" to the detriment of foreign countries. No matter what topic was discussed, she returned to this theme, much to the confusion of the participants, none of whom had had contact with a U.S. aid program. Another speaker in a panel discussion was a private consultant, whose transparent objective was to persuade the participants of the indispensability of his services. At the end of the discussion, he distributed his business cards to each participant, and during the entire session he tried to impress the participant from Brazil, a country with which his business had strong ties.

Problems are also apt to develop when other organizations are asked to operate a segment of the program. Many programs include an orientation portion that is designed and administered by the staff of a completely separate institution. Participants in programs that include internships, site visits, or study tours that take them away from the host institution are likely to encounter people and situations that can be unsettling. It is inevitable to a large extent, since program administrators cannot cover all fields and do want to expose the participants to a variety of people and experiences. Problems are bound to occur when the administrators do not have complete control of the program and participants.

Effective Program Administration

Short specialized programs can have a variety of outcomes. In the worst-case senario, the participants are quickly disappointed in the program; they reinforce each other's doubts about its worth; they begin to miss their families and to dislike the United States; and they return home having

gained little professionally, having lost time in their jobs, and having determined that it was a mistake to have undertaken the trip. Alternatively, the training may not be apt for the participants, but opportunity for cross-cultural exchange may make the program worthwhile; or, conversely, the training may be rewarding, though the participants had no time to get to know American culture. The best outcome, of course, is a program from which the participants gain, both personally and professionally, and return home feeling that their time was well spent, that they acquired new and useful skills as well as a fund of cross-cultural experience on which they can draw in the future.

To maximize the probability that a program will be professionally and personally enriching to the participants, and to insure against program failure, require a strong commitment on the part of program personnel and institutions. To translate this commitment into appropriate administrative behavior requires continual alertness to potential problems and a repertoire of strategies and tactics to avoid them. A successful program needs careful preparation, meticulous attention to detail during its operation, and sound evaluation procedures.

The acquisition of a specialized program is a feather in the cap of the host institution. A new program can bring novel ideas and interesting people to an institution in an isolated setting. It can mean a fresh source of income to an institution in precarious financial condition. It can offer new life to an office or university department in need of revival or rejuvenation. All of these possible reasons and many others help to explain the fuss that is usually made over the announcement of a new program. But, when the fuss has died down, what readily becomes apparent is the huge investment of time and effort necessary to establish a new program at the host institution.

All efforts at the host institution should first be directed toward a full review of the orignial negotiations and agreement with the program sponsor. Often, there is a substantial lag between the time when the program was proposed and the time when planning actually begins. Government agencies can approve a program in principle one year and not fund it the next. For a number of different reasons, a course in agricultural development for Egyptians at the University of California at Davis has been in the preliminary stages of planning for well over a year and a half. Even a carefully framed program proposal can look strange or even unfeasible after several months have passed. For new programs and for renegotiated programs, the first step is to be certain that all parties to the program -- sponsoring agencies, field personnel, sending country, and host institution administrators -- are aware of goals of the program and their specific roles in accomplishing those goals.

Next, the program negotiators need to find a home for the program at the host institution. Locating a suitable home is not a problem for all programs. Many programs take place at the same university in the same department year after year, although there is a tendency on the part of some sponsors to move a course from the same site after five or so years. The universities of Pittsburgh and Massachusetts have offices to facilitate program arrangements. Finding a proper home can be more difficult at a large institution which does not have a center specifically designated for short training courses. It is particularly difficult for institutions that are not accustomed to running short specialized programs for foreign participants.

Some programs fall quite naturally under the umbrella of a particular department or office. However, the depart-

ment that may seem to be the most logical home and the most congenial base is not necessarily the best one. It may be on the lookout for new programs because it lacks students or clients, but it may not have sufficient staff and faculty to operate a program properly. A university department that is short of students often has fewer full-time faculty members, reduced support staff, and inadequate facilities. In effect, the department may be relegated to lower status in the university hierarchy. The same may be true of an office with diminished status in a large corporation. This is a particular problem for program administrators from that department who must rely heavily on the good will and cooperation of all the parts of the host institution. On the other hand, a department or office with reduced responsibilities may have more time to devote to the design andoperation of short courses. Faculty and staff, with just the right qualifications, may have the considerable amount of time necessary for the management of these courses. The selection of a base for the program should not be made lightly, and it should not go by default.

Preparations for the program can take as long as six months from the time a program is announced until the participants arrive. During this time, staff must be hired, participants selected, travel arrangements made, living arrangements finalized, and the daily schedule of activities confirmed. The decision about who will direct the program is a crucial one. The director needs to be knowledgeable about the content area of the program and also be sensitive to cultural differences. A special set of leadership and administrative qualities is also needed to run a cross-cultural training program. The director is at once manager, insturctor, counselor, and, of course, interpreter of American life. On the one hand, the director and the entire staff must be vigorous activists; on the other hand, they must not be overpowering or domineering. All the planning possible will be to no avail if a program is not run competently and sensibly once it begins.

Evaluation is an important component of any short course. All program evaluation is fraught with difficulty, but evaluation of cross-cultural programs is particularly difficult. The major problem is that the participants return home after the program, and it is inevitably hard to know at such a distance what impact the program has had on their lives and careers. It is easier to obtain evaluation of a program while the participants are still in the United States, but more meaningful evaluation is only obtainable when it is harder to secure.One of the most common dimensions of cultural difference is the reluctance to verbalize displeasure among some groups and the excessive willingness to voice criticism among others. Securing measured and genuinely felt feedback about the program, while the participants are taking part in the program, is no mean feat. It is far more valuable, but far more difficult, to assess the effects of a specialized short course once the participants have been home for many months.

The host institution that undertakes to prepare for a program receives no warranty that its investment of time, effort, and resources will acturally result in the program it anticipates. Nor is there any guarantee that a program will be repeated after its first time around, which is always the most costly. Programs have been delayed by airline strikes, floods, and famines. Military coups and other changes of government in sending countries have cancelled programs altogether. These circumstances, however, are the exceptions. Most well administered programs are repeated many times, though usually with some modification. Programs do end because the specific content is no

longer necessary to the sending country or other sponsors, but the experience and expertise that have been gained by administrators at the host institution can easily be transfered to developing other programs. When cooperative ventures between the sending country and host institutions produce successful short courses, other participants are frequently encouraged to return to the host institution for future programs.

1. This article is drawn in part from a longer monograph entitled "Making International Programs Work." Material for this article was derived from interviews with government officials and directors of short courses, as will as from my own experience as co-director of the African Educators Program. I am grateful to my co-director, Ann Ferren, who shared with me many insights into the management of short courses. I alone, however, am responsible for the conclusions reached in this article.
2. Figures were supplied by the Statistics Analysis Office of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, Washington, D.C., and by the Fulbright Grantee Scholar Report, 1976-1980.
3. Information supplied by ICA officials.
4. National Association for Foreign Student Affairs Newsletter, Vol. 31, No. 7 (May 1980), p. 202
5. The Institute of International Education reports that 35 percent of all foreign students at American Universities come from OPEC countries. National Association for Foreign Student Affairs Newsletter, Vol 32, No. 2 (December 1980), p. 29.
6. President's Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies Strength through Wisdom: a Critique of U.S. Capability (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1979)

copyright © 1981, Herbert Maza

ASSESSING THE CONTRIBUTION OF OVERSEAS INSTITUTIONAL AMERICAN COLLEGE SYSTEMS

BY

HERBERT MAZA

Marginal to the systematized American University system within the United States is the existence of about 30 independent American colleges and universities overseas. A few have been established for over a century, others for 50 years after the First World War, and the largest number during the last 30 years, after the end of the Second World War.

There are substantial similarities and differences among them. All are American in origin and most often have legal status and trustees in the United States. They follow an American academic calendar, syllabii, degree requirements and academic administrative practices.

Differences are due to geography, history, and functional goals. Those of one hundred years age were established abroad by American missionaries (in contrast to the practices in British colonies which sent brilliant students to Oxford, Cambridge or London; the French, which sent students to the Sorbonne; or the Germans, who sent them back to German universities such as Heidelberg).

American universities at that time, Yale, Harvard and Princeton, not only did not have prestige abroad, but were hardly known.

A second transitional wave of missionary colleges was established after the First World War in Cairo, Beirut, Teheran, Lahore, Seoul, Tokyo and elsewhere, often primarily for women students.

The mixed motives of the founders for attempting conversions -- largely unsuccessful with the Moslem population, but most effective with local Christian groups such as Armenians, Greek Orthodox, Catholic and other sects -- was complemented by a humanitarian ideal of enriching the lives of a depressed population.

In addition to teaching the Bible, their sectarian beliefs, philosophy, languages, sciences and history they also taught courses on health, agriculture, domestic and business skills.

By the 1950's, after the Second World War, a new vector developed due to a responsive monitored concept emerging within the United States to complement "exclusive" Study Abroad Programs by establishing semi-independent centers. These would serve a host of colleges and universities who could send students abroad for specialized studies, without the responsibilities or expense of establishing their own overseas program centers.

Dr. Herbert Maza lives in Aix-en-Provence, France. He is Secretary General of the Association of International Colleges and Universities and Director of the Institute for American Universities.

In addition, the existence of millions of Americans living abroad led not only to the establishment of hundreds of primary and secondary schools in cities as disparate as Tangiers, Bucharest and Daharan, but also to pressures for two-year and then four-year American independent overseas colleges.

The result has been a synchretic evolution that has combined these functions of the development of junior year study abroad programs to accept sophomores and seniors and later, freshmen.

These colleges were often incorporated in the States in Delaware or Washington D.C. for the authority to offer the Associate in Arts degrees.

Inevitably they were assailed with applications from local non-American students asking for admission. Some overseas American colleges may now have less than a third American enrollments, with a majority of students from countries such as Turkey, Nigeria, Jordan, the Gulf States, Kuwait, Lebanon and Iran. The Trustees of the American College in Barcelona are reported to have closed that institution because of the very few American and Spanish students enrolled in proportion to the overwhelming presence of Third World students. At the same time pressures were mounting for the "missionary" colleges and universities to dilute their original goals of exclusively serving the local population by accepting American Study Abroad Programs. Slowly there have been inroads, often fought as rear-guard actions, so that American undergraduates can be accepted for an academic year or semester in these colleges in the Middle and Far East.

As these impacts grew, there was a realization of common interests to be developed and guidlines to be exchanged. There were abortive efforts to form an association of international colleges in the 60's, which did not succeed. However, early in the next decade, the overseas American university community had stabilized to such an extent that an Association of International Colleges and Universities was founded. In addition to exchanging information, it was striking to see how similar developments took place each year on campuses ranging from Arundel, England to Athens, Greece, and most often reflecting trends not only in the host countries but also within the United States.

The heads of institutions could exchange information on course practices, social security obligations, tuition policies, teacher and student exchanges, calendars and academic standards.

Through association it was hoped to validate the academic levels being offered abroad. At one time the Association had cited accreditation as its goal. However, as the New England and Middle State Associations have now agreed to accredit overseas colleges, most of the colleges are now accredited or in the process of being accredited by stateside associations.

As the economical and political climate changed, and with it a diminution of the flow of American applicants and a corresponding increase from other countries, certain responses were noted: "American" is still a highly regarded title, but "International" is now considered more accurate.

Many in the Levant noted that the title "College" means a secondary school in the Middle East. However, the adoption of the title "University" implies considerable resources. A proposed solution was to create a consortium of cooperative colleges, along the models of Oxford and Cambridge, and with constitutent colleges in Beirut, Athens, Rome, and Aix-en-Provence to create a "Univeristy of the Mediterranean." Inevitably, such a creation has met with considerable criticism over the five

years since it was voiced and it is still in the transitional process of establishment.

Only about 30,000 American undergraduates out of 11,000,000 students do study abroad each year -- .03% -- while we live in an international world that not only influences but often dominates the daily dynamics of our lives!

The international American colleges, in a period of academic economic recession, allow a host of institutions that do not have the staff or finances to offer their own programs of study abroad (which 50 years ago had been almost exclusively reserved for students from private Eastern establishments) to do so in another way. They also provide intermediate steps for either Americans or others overseas to start an American college education before transfer to the United State. The overseas colleges also prepare students for graduate studies in the United States.

The overseas American institutions have participated in American aid programs by providing a supply of educated individuals who can help American proposals for the local population, and also by providing a base for understanding United States' politics, economics, history, culture and language.

The overseas American institutions provide courses on international business, research bases for both medical and social projects, and support for a favorable attitude towards the United States. (It might be noted that even at the height of his anti-Americanism in Egypt, President Nassar sent his daughter to an American University in Cairo.)

Thus this small group of American institutions potentially, and actually, are a reservoir to impartially present aspects of American culture and society that redress the images seen on commercial television and the cinema. They allow for an exchange that facilitates economic and financial exchanges between the United States and more than a dozen countries.

They help American university students and professors to obtain insights into other societies and civilizations that they could not otherwise obtain.

They are available to cooperate with American colleges and universities which wish to enrich their modern language and international studies through student exchange and a welcome to visiting faculty members.

The establishment of overseas independent university colleges is uniquely American. Primary schools had been established abroad by the British; the French lycee can be found in almost every capital city in the world, but for independent university college education it has been exclusively an American phenomenon that has come into being and which now either coexists with, or has inspired, the establishment of domestic universities in dozens of countries around the world.